

Sandra Lyn Bailey

Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 6:53 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
MAR 2 4 2006
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

04-207

Della Perino {} writes:

Chairman Martin,

I am writing to you in regard to the article in our Stockton Record about the ALA carte programm in cable that you are interested in establishing. Please, contact me. My phone is 209-462-1343. My address 521 Sharon Ave, Stockton, Ca, 95205.
Sincerely,
Della Perino

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.194.166.23
Remote IP address: 63.194.166.23

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

0

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: albert strimel [budstrimel@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 3:27 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Cable Monopoly

America is great because of competition, Americans deserve a choice.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
ENCLASODE

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Donald Shemenske [dpgolf@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 5:49 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
MAR 2 5 2006
Federal Communications Commission

Donald Shemenske (dpgolf@comcast.net) writes:

Thank you for supporting "ala Carte" selection of cable programing. It would be helpful if we could purchase the cable box. The cable companies are getting rich charging \$12.00 per month for rental year after year. We have no option at time to buy the box.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.252.208.114
Remote IP address: 69.252.208.114

No. of Copies of List ABCDE 0

Sandralyn Bailey

From: gail pat parsons, ph.d. [gparsons@gdn.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 10:55 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
MAR 2 2006
Federal Office

04-201

gail pat parsons, ph.d. (gparsons@gdn.edu) writes:

I wholeheartedly support a la carte cable programming. I only watch about a quarter of the channels I am paying for (and more and more each year). For example, there are at least four spanish language channels that are of no interest to me; neither do I have an interest in the cartoon channel, the game show channel, etc., etc.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 168.26.245.225
Remote IP address: 168.26.245.225

No. of Copies Recd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

From: James Barrow [jbarrow12@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 9:51 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

04-207
RECEIVED
MAR 2 2 2006
Federal Communications Commission

James Barrow (jbarrow12@comcast.net) writes:

I saw the Senate hearings with the cable companies :(and Verizon and ATT :)

AS one Senator addressed cable company "don't you offer phone service ? :) ...soft reply "yes" Well whats good for the goose is good for the gander.

A "SIGNIFICANT" "IMPORTANCE" should be placed on the repersentative for the consumer. AS he stated when there is compition prices are 20 to 30% lower and usually more choices. When there is no compition prices are 20 to 30% higher, with less options.

I remmber back in the days of President Ragen, the Wall Street Journal was going bannas over the take over of all the small cable companies at prices of \$200 to \$350 per subscriber. "HOW CAN THEY MAKE \$\$\$" per wall street.

Well Reagin eleminated the regulations and cable rates jumped from 19.95 to \$114 today. With zero regulations it should be open to the phone companies to supply cable. The intial outlay is expensive and it takes big \$\$\$ to set up an operation. Only ATT and Verizon said they would spend \$ BILLIONS " thats with a B. As far as right of ways , they do not belong to the cable company. All can use the same right of way. 30 years ago the phone company and the electric company used the same right of way. I worked for an electric co. and they allways complained that Phone company would wait until Elec had dug 36" trench and phone would come back over the nice tilled earth and lay phone lines at 18".

SERVE THE PUBLIC. REGULATIONS HAVE BEEN ELIMINATED. NO MORE MONOPERLY. GIVE THE CONSUMER A CHOICE AND STOP SERVING THE CORP \$\$\$. THE LOSS OF CABLE CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE GREATLY OVERSHADOWED BY \$\$\$\$ CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PHONE COMPANIES, A WIN WIN

Thanks for your consideration for the public.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.57.86.228
Remote IP address: 68.57.86.228

No. of Copies Rec'd 0
List ABCDE

From: James J. McHaley [jjm9966@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 05, 2006 7:57 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Dear Mr. Martin,

Let me start by saying I want "A LA CARTE PRICING" for my cable TV choices. I am going to be 62 years old on April 29 and neither my wife or I watch Home Shopping, MTV, Nickelodeon, Disney, Cartoon, Spanish Speaking channels or many others that I will not take up your time listing. In order for my wife to watch her two favorite channels, "Hallmark" and "Biography" we are forced to subscribe to a Comcast package that is two tiers up from what we actually need. Everything I read reagrding this matter is about parents concerned about programs that their children are watching. I have not read one single article regarding the senior retirees living on a fixed income and the amount they are forced to spend on cable television. Chairman Martin, if you are able to change the way cable companies charge their customers, please make it a true a la catre pricing and not special interest tiers, family tiers or any kind of tiers. My wife and I would like to purchase the channels we want to watch. I thank you for the opportunity to share with you my thoughts on this matter.

James and Linda McHaley
8084 Windwood Way
Parker, Colorado 80134

```
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 207.200.116.6
Remote IP address: 207.200.116.6
```

No. of Copies sold 0
LIBABCOE

04-201

Sandralyn Bailey

From: John Lundgren [john.lundgren@dmjmharris.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 12:52 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

REC-111
MAY 2 2006
FBI/DOJ

John Lundgren (john.lundgren@dmjmharris.com) writes:

Mr. Martin,

I read an article in USA Today proposing a la carte programming from cable and satellite providers and I am in full support of this. I too fall in the category of having expanded basic and have approximately 60 channels. Of all these channels I probably watch 20 of them. Thus I am being charged for all 60 of these channels, but I am only viewing one-third of the programming. The a la carte sytem is definitely more consumer friendly and would decrease my monthly cable bill.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.117.216.60
Remote IP address: 63.117.216.60

No of Characters _____
LIBRARY

04-207

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Kathleen Wagar [kwagar@copper.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 12:17 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
MAR 2 3 2006
KJMWEB

Kathleen Wagar (kwagar@copper.net) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin

I vote for ala carte program choice mainly because my cable provider Comcast has raised the basic rates so high. Now it has bought out Time Warner in Minneapolis, its only competition. I think their rates are outrageous. Oh, they had to pay for the new optic cables. Always an excuse for their rates, that go up more than inflation each year. I've gone down to just the basics--\$15 to add HBO? Or another cartoon channel? All for a few hours of viewing a day? As Bruce Springsteen said: 57 channels and there's nothing on.

Most importantly, are you in charge of Internet cable connections. I was stunned to read the US has one of the slowest, and most expensive, connection rates. Asia 10X faster than we are with cheaper rates because they have invested billions more dollars than we have?

Another sign of America going down the tubes, and I blame Bush. What's it going to take, besides money, to get our speed up to match our competitors?

Sincerely

Kathleen Wagar
Minneapolis

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.45.140.154
Remote IP address: 65.45.140.154

RECEIVED
MAR 2 3 2006
KJMWEB

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Lee Kneppel [QTUly@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 11:46 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
MAR 2 2006
KJMWEB

Lee Kneppel (QTUly@aol.com) writes:

In the Boston Globe, there was an article that you support "a la carte" programming. I fully agree with your position. My Comcast cable bill just hit \$50 and I do not watch sports. I do not feel that I should indirectly be subsidizing that industry and the multimillion dollar salaries. Please continue to push a la carte. Thank you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.63.102.132
Remote IP address: 24.63.102.132

Number of Copies sold 0
TOTAL DRE

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Monteath B Petersen [monteathp@erols.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 7:16 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
MAR 2 2 2006

Monteath B Petersen (monteathp@erols.com) writes:

Hooray for Ala Carte Cable. My kids make me get cable for two or three channels. Cartoon Network and maybe the animal channel. That is all I would buy and trash the rest. I only need Local and PBS which I get for free. Sincerely Monty Petersen.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 207.172.91.187
Remote IP address: 207.172.91.187

No. of Copies Recd. 0
LIST ABOVE

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Robert Parker [parker.robertj@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2006 1:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Robert Parker (parker.robertj@gmail.com) writes:

Mr. Chairman:

I urge you to make available "a la carte" purchasing of cable television channels.

~Robert Parker
(Albany, NY)

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.118.56.126
Remote IP address: 63.118.56.126

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

04207

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Ronald K. Fairchild [Go2ronf@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 6:12 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Ronald K. Fairchild (Go2ronf@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin,

Thank you for your support for buying programming à la carte. I would love to buy all of the channels I watch à la carte. I used to when I had a big 10 foot satellite dish. For the past five years I've been a DISH Network customer because there's no cable service here in my rural neighborhood. I'm paying hundreds of dollars per year for the basic cable channels I get. I don't get some of the channels I would like to because they're in a more expensive package and I'm already paying too much for programming. If I could choose the channels I want, I could still get all the channels I want and still save money. I'm paying for dozens and dozens of channels I don't watch. And, I don't like paying for channels with content I find morally offensive. I've been reading several articles on the Internet and according to them, the CEO of DISH Network is a big fan of à la carte programming. Apparently he would love to sell programming on a per channel basis, but the programmers, many of which are owned by cable companies, won't let him sell it that way. I'm hoping soon I'll be able to pick only the channels I want to subscribe to. I've checked out the family-friendly packages offered by both dish providers and neither one of them come close to fulfilling my programming needs. Thank you for your time and for your support for buying programming à la carte. Sincerely, Ronald Fairchild
245 Russell Lewis Rd. West Liberty, KY 41472

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.176.60.51
Remote IP address: 69.176.60.51

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Rosemary N. Palmer [floridalawlady@mstar2.net]
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2006 4:45 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate
Cc: corporate_communications@comcast.com
Subject: Ability to buy cable stations individually

Dear FCC Commissioners and Florida legislators,

I thought you should know what Comcast's response to consumer desires to individually buy cable access consistent with their values and desires looks like in Tallahassee FL. Comcast announced that it was changing the least costly bundle by removing several family oriented programs. In addition, they included these stations with a package that includes MTV and another music video station that displays what many of us believe are soft core porn.

It doesn't sound at all like they have changed their ways, no matter what their statements to Congress a few months ago said. Please support legislation that require public service channels to be included in the lowest cost tier and permits customers to otherwise select and pay for those stations that they choose.

Rosemary N. Palmer
Tallahassee FL
850 668 9203

No. of Copies rec'd _____ 0 _____
List ABOVE

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Susan Snyder [srs987@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 7:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Susan Snyder (srs987@aol.com) writes:

I urge you to continue the fight on cable companies offering ala carte channels. We are currently paying almost \$50 per month for expanded basic channels with Comcast - with Comcast being the ONLY cable company in my area. After researching satellite options, again, almost \$50 -- both with a ton of channels we do not want...and do not need. Those who are on fixed incomes in my little area of West Virginia are soon not going to be able to afford to watch television. Thank you for your time.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.188.116.12
Remote IP address: 205.188.116.12

No. of Copies rec'd 0
LIST ABOVE

04-207

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Tom Young [TomYoungAA@netscape.net]
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2006 1:09 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Tom Young (TomYoungAA@netscape.net) writes:

As a self-employed father of 2 young kids, in a start up business, I have only about 2 hours of TV multi-tasking available to me. During the week, that's mainly for news, weather, special programming. Over the weekend, there may be a movie, history, or science. Under the above scenario, that means I only watch about 8-9 channels. Could you have someone explain to me why I have to subscribe to 100 channels to get those that I want? We all know that the technology is here, (and it's cheap), and the cable companies have used it for decades to their advantage. Now we find out the channels must people watch only cost about 25 cents, compared to dollars for others. Suggestion: Publish the cost of all the channels, mark it up by whatever their gross profit report shows, and..... LET PEOPLE PICK THE SHOWS THEY ACTUALLY WANT! At least we should have a test market somewhere. I don't think I'm different from most, in fact, polls show that we're a majority. Please get this ridiculous problem fixed.

Thanks
Tom Young

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.141.9.116
Remote IP address: 71.141.9.116

Doc. of Code used 0
LISTABODE

04-207

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Bills email [bl4993@vcmails.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 05, 2006 5:56 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: a la cart satellite tv

Hi, I would just like to weigh in on the a la carte satellite and cable TV issue. I bet you can't find 10 viewers in the world (not affiliated with the industry) who wouldn't like to choose their TV channels as opposed to getting dumped on by the programming sellers. In the old days Dish had a pick 10 channels for \$15. it is gone now. I actually view about 15 total channels but have to subscribe to 180 to get them on my receiver. Please do what you can to make a la cart programming happen. Thanks Bill Morgan

No. of Copies Held 0
List ABCDE

3/15/2006

04-207

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: John Cooper [cooper47@rittermail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 11, 2006 3:30 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: FCC complaint

From: John Cooper
62 CR 396
Jonesboro, Arkansas 72401
870-972-0702

March 11, 2006

re: cable television complaint to FCC commissioner:

To: Mr. Kevin Martin, FCC Commissioner

Dear Mr. Martin,

I am writing to you in the hopes that you will support the effort to enable cable subscribers to purchase the stations and programming that best suits our interests rather than having someone select it for us through packages that most of which we do not want.

As an example, this weekend I was not able to watch the teams of the Southeastern Conference in the basketball tournament because the locals somehow blocked it from us. When we complained to both the local station, KAIT channel 8 which is an ABC affiliate and the cable company, Ritter Communications, they each blamed the other. Something is wrong when Arkansas residents can't watch the Arkansas Razorbacks in the conference tournament.

We get approximately 52 stations on our package along with internet service and spend over \$70 a month. We could watch tournaments from all over the country but could not watch the one of the most interest to this region. My view is that of the 52 stations that our dollars are required to support, we don't want over 30 of them but we do want to have the ability to access things of high interest to us. I suspect that the reason this happened was not because of local interest but because KAIT could pull in a few more advertising dollars by doing it this way.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

John R. Cooper

Phone: 870-972-0702
List: ABODE 0

3/15/2006

04-2007

Sandralyn Bailey

From: John Disosway [rivermarsh@firstva.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 9:37 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: A La Carte Cable

Dear Mr. Martin:

I am very pleased to see that you are a major proponent of "a la carte" pricing for cable television. I have been interested to see that the major argument in favor of a la carte pricing is to protect children from having access to undesirable programming, which is an important and worthwhile issue to promote.

I personally have another issue that I have yet to see addressed. My family has never subscribed to a programming provider - we are still relying on a roof-mounted antenna - because *we will not spend our money to support the violence and depravity that abounds on some of the channels that come with bundled packages*. I fully believe that many of these channels could not continue to operate if consumers had to pay for them individually. If they could no longer profitable operate, we would all win. Children are not the only members of our society that are negatively influenced by a daily barrage of smut and violence; our whole culture is adversely impacted by the disgraceful content of so much of the "entertainment" industry's products. Even our nation's enemies have declared that one compelling reason they have for wishing to destroy us is the moral depravity they see being glorified in the American media.

Offering a la carte programming makes sense for several other reasons as well:

- It lets the free-market system work; popular channels would do well and would no longer be subsidizing unpopular channels;
- It lets parents bar unwanted programming in their homes;
- It makes access to unredeeming programming a little more difficult for everyone;
- It may be cheaper for consumers, according to your studies;
- It might generate revenue from new sources, such as my family!

Thank you for your vocal support of this issue. Please keep up the good work!

Sincerely,
Rebecca Disosway
Louisa, Virginia

File of Copies rec'd 0
UNLACIDE

3/15/2006

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: John F. Richmond [jrichmond@woh.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 5:33 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: A La Carte Cable

The article in USA Today is very encouraging, regarding cable TV packages, and I'm pleased that you're a fan of individual choice. Heck, we're paying for 15 or so channels which we never watch, hence we're subsidizing them, and enabling Time Warner Cable to make some fat profits. Heck, I'm a Pittsburgh Pirates and Steelers (whoopee !) fan, and I bet if I could request specific channels I could watch every game, for *less* money per month. Work as hard as you can on this, and thanks in advance ! Respectfully, Jay Richmond, Dayton, OH

No. of Copies rec'd 0
Date 3/15/06

3/15/2006

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Kurt Arnold [kurtarnoldmail@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 12, 2006 8:10 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Cc: FCCINFO
Subject: January 19, 2006 hearings on the Regulation of Media Decency/ Cable TV/ 1470 AM WKLZ in Kalamazoo Michigan

Dear Chairman & Commissioners:

I hope I am not taking up too much of your valuable time today but I have two issue I would like to discuss today. First on Thursday January 19, 2006 the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, & Transportation had hearings on the Regulation of Media Decency. The Cable/Satellite industry was supposed to make a big announcement about a new "Family-Friendly" line-up of channels and "Cable Choice". This is exciting to me because in my family we are all big sports fans but in order to get sports packages you have to get some other channels too. Usually HBO or Cinemax and according to a friend of mine who works for Dish Network, those channels started planning really smutty stuff that no one should be exposed to. I don't want that smut in my house, ever! I contacted my Michigan Senator Debbie Stabenow but she only sent me information pertaining to registering an official complaint with the FCC. While that information is useful, it is not the information I had requested. I was hoping that you could assist me. As I said above, in my family we are huge sports fans and so the only reason we would get cable is for the sports like English Football (Soccer) available on the ESPN Networks and Fox Soccer, Baseball, Basketball and the Olympics. I would also get Boomerang (Classic Cartoons), TVLand (classic TV sitcoms), Superstation WGN (for Chicago Cubs Baseball), Fox News and Hallmark Channel. Those are all family oriented networks. If we could only get those types of channels that we would actually watch, then we might consider hooking up the box

I have been a listener to 1470 WKLZ in Kalamazoo Michigan since I heard that they had began broadcasting Chicago Cubs baseball in Kalamazoo. I was looking forward to another season of Cubs baseball on WKLZ and went to 1470 and there was nothing but static. I thought there was just a signal problem so I checked back later yesterday evening and there was still nothing. Strange. I called the producer for Fairfield Radio and was told that WKLZ was off the air. The next day I wrote an email to Ken Lanphear, Vice President/Operations at Fairfield Broadcasting Company (Fairfield Broadcasting owns WKZO, WQSN and WKLZ) In his reply, Mr. Lanphear told me, "WKLZ went off the air on February 20th as part of a long-standing agreement with the Federal Communications Commission that enabled us to own the more powerful signal at AM 1660, WQSN-AM. At this time, our two other stations have contracts with other baseball clubs, WKZO with the Tigers and WQSN with the Kalamazoo Kings. We are currently negotiation on a partial schedule of Cubs games for times when the Tigers and Kings are not playing. WQSN will carry a good part of the ESPN baseball schedule and I would expect a limited number of Cubs games this year on WKZO and WQSN." Why would you need to give up a radio station to get a stronger signal for another station? That just seems rather strange! Is there any way that WKLZ could be put back on the air? See I have been a Cubs fan since age 9. (in 1987) See I was in Chicago for a major back/spine operation and listened to the game broadcast every chance I had. I sincerely hope the Cubs will be back on the air soon in Kalamazoo because WGN Radio comes in at my house but it's very faint. Please let me know what's happening. Because I figure that since the White Sox won it last year the Cubs can do it this year. All they have to do is make sure that people don't wear headphones and actually pay attention to the game. If that gentlemen had been paying attention to the game, he would've known that the ball was still in 0

3/15/2006

play and Kenny Lofton would have made the catch and the cubs would've have been on their way to the world series. Would they have won? Maybe. But who wants to keep reliving ancient history. But still. What if??? Think about it. The Red Sox won in 04 and broke a curse, The White Sox last year and now it's 2006 and if the pattern holds.....maybe, just maybe. I hope I'll be able to hear Pat scream, "Cubs WIN the big one and oh boy, the goat has left the building" Heaven knows they deserve it! Oh, if you want to contact Mr. Lanphear, his Direct number is 269-488-3805. The FAX line is 269-345-1436 and the e-mail is kenl@fairfield-radio.com He is a very kind gentleman!
Thanks for your time and effort. I look forward to your reply! Again, I am sorry If I wasted your valuable time, but please help if you can.

Warm Regards,
Kurt Arnold
5313 Rugby St
Portage, MI 49024 USA

Yahoo! Mail
Bring photos to life! New PhotoMail makes sharing a breeze.

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Bill Murray [BMurray@NJSEA.COM]
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2006 2:18 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Cable ala carte

I am all for changing the way cable services force you to pay for unwanted channels and unwanted racy programming.

Where else can I voice my opinion to help change this,
thank you,. William Murray

3/15/2006

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Luis S. Villacorta [VILLACL@wyeth.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 12:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: I Support A-la-Carte Cable Programming!

Dear Mr. Martin:

I support your mission to require a-la-carte cable TV programming!!! It's time that the consumers should be heard. It has been a long time since the consumers have been fleeced by these cable operators!

Comcast is my cable operator. I only watch only 1/3 of the TV channels that I am offered in my expanded basic. I feel like we are the victims of the cable's greed. I would like to pick and choose my channels. I hardly watch ESPN, Lifetime, Bravo, USA and other channels. I am subsidizing other viewers.

Keep up the battle for a-la-carte programming!!!

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Luis S. Villacorta
Email Address: v1205man@comcast.net

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABUSE

3/15/2006

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Robert Blanton [robertblanton@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 9:22 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Cable TV

Dear Sir,

Please, please, please change policy so that we consumers are not forced to pay for programming we do not want. All the cable and satellite companies need do is charge a basic rate for, say, 10 programs, with the consumer choosing the programs he or she wishes to purchase. In addition to that, they could offer a 15 program rate, 20 program rate, etc. They could also offer all channels on a pay-per-view basis so that if someone did not have a particular channel in his package, but wanted to view that channel for whatever reason, then the consumer could pay a fee, just as consumers pay now.

I think this approach will not only benefit consumers but would also benefit television broadcasting companies.

Thank You,

Robert Blanton
3616 Harden Blvd. #161
Lakeland, FL 33803

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

3/15/2006

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: William Cook [cook.william@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 8:50 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; FCCINFO
Subject: I strongly support "a la carte"

Chairmen and commissioners,

I would like to express my strong support for a "a la carte" approach to cable programming. For too long I have had to purchase inappropriate channels simply to get channels like ESPN or Cartoon Network. A system that allowed me to choose which channels I would purchase would put the power back into my hands. It would also ensure that channels that couldn't compete would go out of business. Please move this forward!

William Cook
1001 Newhaven Court
Birmingham, AL 35242

--

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

No. of Copies Rec'd 0
List ABCDE

3/15/2006